

# British Reaction Regarding the First Massacres in Turkey

By:  
Archbishop Arsen Berberian, Ph.D.

“The course of England with regard to this question seems to be inexplicable. In order to maintain her influence in Turkey, she must be the champion of religious freedom. This would unite the sympathies of all the Christian races. Nothing less than this can by any possibility bring the Turkish administration into harmony with its environment.”<sup>1</sup>

The earnest desire of the Armenian people that the British Government should participate in their life met with only grudging response. But England was more ready with their aid in alleviating the sufferings of the Armenian Christians during the massacres that ravaged the country during the period 1880 – 1891. By the very presence of missionaries in Armenia, the British were able to observe first hand the progress of the massacres and were even able to intervene at several points. In this light, the Protestant Churches in Armenia becomes as much a civil institution as a religious.

By 1888, the Armenian Patriotic Association had been convened in London. Its objective was to secure civil rights for the persecuted in Armenia. The Chairman, G. Hagopian, directed an appeal made by the Christians in Armenia, to the notice of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop in his turn, forwarded the copies of the Appeal to the Lord Rosberry, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. He writes, “If, as I suppose, the statements made in the memorial can be substantiated, then the matter seems to be one of great moment. Calculated to awaken deep sympathy among Christian communities in England as well as abroad.”<sup>2</sup>

The Archbishop received a communication on May 21, 1888 from the Foreign Office, acknowledging the receipt of the Memorials from the Committee of Armenian Residents in London; the papers would be sent to the British Ambassador at Constantinople so that he might report on the statements of fact contained therein, so that the Government might be able to determine whether it would indeed be judicious to lay the complaints before the Turkish Ministers. The Foreign Office also indicated, however, that in a matter respecting the Treaty of Berlin, it would be impossible for Britain alone to act effectively, unless other Governments were also sounded as to the position of the Armenians.

The Ambassador, Sir W. White had replied that the statements forwarded were so involved that it would take some time to examine them in depth.

“In view, however, the letter continues of the existing situation in the East, it is not in my opinion, desirable in the interest of the Armenians themselves that this question should be agitated at present.”<sup>3</sup>

In the absence of the Marquis of Salisbury, the letter was signed J. Pauncefote.

The letter shows both the willingness and the crippling diplomacy that characterized British policy in relation to Armenia.

Nevertheless, sympathy was growing for the Armenian nation, in England and abroad; besides the formation of the Armenian Patriotic Association, a bulletin was regularly published by it in French and entitled Le Hairasdan. Moreover, in America a communication was sent to the President of the United States in which the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church wrote, “The extent of these massacres is not fully known, but enough is known to reveal the horror of the situation and to call for the indignant protest of all civilized and Christian people. It is estimated . . . that no less than three hundred and fifty thousand of our fellow Christians are now suffering and are in danger of perishing in consequence of the massacres in Central Turkey, and that at least fifty thousand have been already murdered in Trebizond and Erzeroum, in the provinces of Bitlis, Van and Harpoot, etc.” The letter continued, “We sincerely trust that some measure or measures consistent with national traditions and the rational dignity may be devised and that speedily . . . We feel profoundly that our nation should cease to recognize the Turkish Government as a civilized power, so long as its barbarous treatment of the Armenians continues, and that it should bring every influence to bear on the civilized nations of Europe which may cause them to provide a united front in demanding that such atrocities cease at once and forever.”<sup>4</sup> The communication was signed by

thirteen of the Episcopal Bishops. Then their consternation was very understandable because the massacres obviously placed the American Protestant mission in jeopardy, a mission which over the years had been flourishing as a consequence of the labours of the American missionaries.

In England too, interest was growing among a section of the people other than the Armenians. In a letter to the Times, 29<sup>th</sup> May 1889, a Mr. Ledmond asks the Undersecretary of State for Foreign Affairs “whether the Government will take any steps toward putting a stop to these horrible occurrences in view of the fact that England is empowered under the Anglo-Turkish convention of 1878, to interfere on behalf of good Government in Armenia.”<sup>5</sup> The letter implied that England had taken her treaty obligations too lightly. “A letter to the Times, dated April 13, 1889, from George P. Devez, M.M. Vice Consul in Van, not unduly sympathetic in tone, considers the Armenian population in these districts [Van] restless and disaffected but possessed of a minimum capacity for causing any serious trouble to the Turkish Government. There is no doubt that subsequent to the Berlin Treaty there has been a considerable amount of revolutionary agitation at work. This culminated four or five years ago in an abortive attempt to form secret societies similar to those existing in Bulgaria prior to 1875 and to procure arms.”<sup>6</sup>

The letter gives the impression that the Armenians were restive without provocation, and that somehow they were the instigators of the agitation in the provinces. Yet how could a nation behave otherwise in the face of the huge decimation of its population?

The intimations of the interest, which the English public had been showing, were not confined to that country alone. Evidence of this had reached Armenia itself, and gave the people a ready quarter towards which to direct their appeals, thereby establishing a relationship of a sort between the two countries. Even though on an official level, relations between the nations had been decidedly cool as a consequence of the Berlin Conference. The simple folk, drawn into this horrendous whirlwind, were not to know this, and turned instinctively towards Great Britain. This foreign interest prompted, for instance, the prisoners of Zeitun, in Armenia to direct their petitions to the notice of the British Foreign Office. The Question of the imprisoned clergymen in Armenia formed a major aspect of wider implications of the Armenian question in the problem was one which ensured, on however small a scale, a continuity of the relations between the two countries. It was just as well, for the imprisoned clergymen that pressure on their behalf was exerted by Britain, because the outcome, however long in coming, was favourable to them.

Zeitun had been the center of the Armenian revolutionary movement since 1862.<sup>7</sup>

Zeitun was the focal point of the disturbances following 1862, but of the history prior to that date, a number of imprisoned clergymen had sent an account to Lord Roseberry. Corruption and oppression were widespread. In 1862 the Porte despatched 44,000 troops against the mountaineers of Zeitun, who destroyed 7,000 of them in self defense. The Porte had repeatedly violated the independence of these mountain people, who had been forced to revolt. In 1876, 1884, and 1887, the Porte had set Zeitun on fire. During the next two years the people had been occupied in driving out the plundering tribes of Turks. Turkomans, Ancassians, and Kurds who perpetually descended on their villages. “Trusting first in God, and afterwards in Great Britain, we even look to our speedy deliverance, compensation for the wrongs suffered during our three years’ imprisonment and the renovation of our affairs.”

Zeitun in 1890, the residence of a Kaimakhan under the Muttesarif of Marash, consisted of about 1270 Christians and 30 Moslem houses, surrounded by 7 Christian and 22 Moslem villages. The statistics quoted by Sir Adam Block, British Consul in Aleppo, show that in Zeitun and its districts, the Armenians numbered approximately 10,000. They were of “fine physique and accustomed for generations to carry arms and capable of using them.”

In His memorandum, Block states that “they are able and ready to assert themselves, and with success resist the oppression of the neighboring Mussulman population and the unjust actions

and ill treatment of the Turkish authorities as the last rising in 1877-78 will show.” The community, though no inherently aggressive, but naturally of a peaceful disposition could yet display resources of skill and ferocity when impelled by adverse circumstances.<sup>9</sup>

Disturbances broke out again in 1890. It happened on the 4th of October 1889 that a Turkish Zaptich was killed at Zeitun. Military intervention resulted in some soldiers being wounded, others killed. The Governor of Marash proceeded to Zeitun to hold an enquiry which led to the arrest of 15 persons. The soldiers retired and blockaded the town. This represented a change of attitude on the part of the Governor of Marash who had formerly behaved in a very conciliatory manner and had removed the Kaimakhan and several gendarmes who had complained about the people of Zeitun.

To aid to the trouble, three circular letters from the Armenians of Zeitun sent on October 21, 1890, reached Aleppo. They were addressed respective to the Catholicos of all Armenians (Etchmiadzin), the Catholicos of See and the Patriarch of Constantinople, and signed “the poor people of Zeitun.” The letter alleged that the Governor of Marash had sent an Armenian doctor to the neighborhood to vaccinate children by force and that as a result over five hundred of them had died. The vaccine, the letter stated, which had come from Constantinople had been poisoned. The letter also blamed the previous Zeitun disturbances upon the unwarranted liberties taken by the Turkish authorities.<sup>10</sup>

This account of the incident gained widespread acceptance for in 1892 (18th October) Minas Cheraz (a member of the Armenian Delegation to the Berlin Conference) despatched a letter to Lord Roseberry, the Foreign Minister. He wrote, “I think it useful today to forward to your Lordship a detailed summary containing at the same time some information that I have just received from a detained layman. I have not the means of checking the grave accusations made against the Turkish authorities but if Her Majesty’s British Government should instruct its representative in Aleppo to make an investigation in Zeitun on the death of five hundred and fifty four children and on the other charges, the truth would be easily discovered.”<sup>11</sup>

“Furthermore, during these disturbances, forty leading Armenians were imprisoned at the ????????? of the Governor of Marash, among them being the Archbishop of Zeitun and Marash. Those people wrote from prison. Their letter discloses that as a result of services rendered, Malek Pasha, the former Governor of Marash who had caused all the trouble, had been ‘rewarded’ with the absolute Governorship of Der Zor, while some fifty others had been similarly rewarded. Twenty of the Turkish who were ‘the immediate authors of the outbreak’ were condemned by the Porte, but by an extraordinary decree were eventually not only granted an Imperial pardon, but were entrusted with the collection of taxes from the wretched villages whom they treated as they pleased.

“The Zeitunians imprisoned were accused on the basis of ten charges which the letter dated 25/6 August 1893 outlined.

“All these condemnations are based on 10 charges:

1st: That 200 Zeitunians assembled in the church and in a few houses in the quarter of Bezbar have shot at the troops (accused ask to be shown a single wounded person).

2nd: That the Zeitunians entered the government premises and helped 2 prisoners escape, (the accused reply that the coffer and the archives have not been touched and that many prisoners escape even from the solid prison of Aleppo).

3rd: That the Zeitunians have built at the Monastery of Sourp-Prguitch an impregnable fortress overlooking the barracks (the accused object that they have repaired the bedrooms destined for pilgrims, and which are separated from the barracks by mountains and valleys).

4th: That the Zeitunians held meetings in the church and elsewhere to deliberate on a plan of insurrections (the accused maintain that they only assembled in church to pray as usual).

5th: That the Zeitunians assembled and distributed money, arms and food (the accused point out that no guns were found even at the house of the 70 – 80 arrested Armenians and that some small sums and food had been distributed as usual to the poor on the occasion of feast-days).

6th: That the Zeitunians distributed munitions (the accused declare that on the route from Marash to Zeitun were seized only one bag of small hunting bullets, 2 ekes of lead with which only 50-60 bullets could be made, 4 litres of sulphur which mountain people use for certain diseases of domestic animals and about a hundred flints used by shepherds to light their cigarettes – all articles of commerce sent by one merchant to another).

7th: That the Zeitunians killed the policeman Osman who had inspected the building of Sourp-Prgutch at the beginning of their revolt (the accused remind that threats of death had been made against Osman by persons who had relations with his wife and sisters and that this death could not have a political character).

8th: That the Zeitunians wounded 3 soldiers (the accused demand that the truly guilty are discovered and punished).

9th: That 10 years ago a Zeitunian composed and propagated anti-Turkish songs (the accused maintain that Mr. Der-Gha-Zarian was in prison during these troubles, that there is no proof against him and that a witness has confessed to having been invited by Salih Pasha give evidence against this innocent poet).

10th: That the Zeitunians were roused to insurrection by the melodious songs of a young religious woman (the accused claim that she be judged instead of being kept among prostitutes in the Aleppo prison).

“The accused had sent cables and petitions to the Patriarchate, to the Sublime Porte and to the Sultan, but in vain. They entreated that at least their case be transferred to the capital if they were not to be granted their freedom, and that a mixed commission, composed of Turks and Englishmen be sent to Zeitun to investigate the death of the five hundred and fifty four children.” The letter continued, “The Aleppo Court of Appeal sent its decision to that of Constantinople where an Armenian lawyer, Mr. Kukor Zohrab will take charge of the defense of the accused. The question is one of extreme urgency: eight detainees have already died, and if intervention is not made in time, the octogenarian Archbishop and the other prisoners could die of the tortures in the Aleppo prison.”<sup>13</sup>

On November 18/30, 1891, the Bishop Vehabedian of Adana sent a letter to the Lord Bishop of Salisbury in which he asked the Bishop to appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury to intercede for freedom for these prisoners of Zeitun and their Bishop. The letter is translated by Darcken Essaycan, a young man well known to the Bishop of Salisbury and in England as a Student of Theology. “For year past, they have been imprisoned in Aleppo” the letter reads, “and suffering under great affliction without any cause as if they had been stirrers of revolution. And they want the help of some philanthropic men.”<sup>14</sup>

As a result of this letter and the information received from other sources, the Archbishop of Canterbury in a communication to the Marquis of Salisbury requested that enquiries be made from the British Ambassador at the Porte, and if need be, that he mediate himself on behalf of the Bishop of Zeitun and the forty-five other Armenians convicted on charges of sedition.<sup>15</sup>

Feb. 24th, 1892

My Lord, having heard from influential and trustworthy sources in Cilicia of the condemnation of the Bishop of Zeitun and forty five other Armenians of Cilicia under circumstances which appear to have been unfavourable to the accused and to involve a very sever, if not harsh and unfair sentence, and having been requested to approach your Lordship on the subject with a view making enquiries of our Ambassador at the Porte, and, if necessary, mediating on their behalf, I venture to lay before your Lordship the enclosed letters and to ask that your Lordship will do me the favour to accuse such enquiries to be made.

I feel sure that, if the case is a deserving one, it will have your Lordship's sympathy and support. I have the honour to remain your Lordship's obedient humble servant.

The Marquis of Salisbury transmitted the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Sir Clare Ford on the 27th February and desired that the result of the proceedings against the prisoners be sent to him.<sup>16</sup>

Consequently on April 19, 1892, Consul Jago informed Sir Clare Ford that when the trial had ended three days previously, twenty six of the forty eight accused had been found guilty. "Among these twenty six are the Bishop of Zeitun, a school teacher and a preacher, the rest being illiterate person of low degree. Besides these fourteen fugitives were tried by default of whom three were acquitted and the remainder found guilty."<sup>17</sup>

The Consul sent a comparatively impartial account of the trial and it would appear that the case for the prosecution was enormously biased. In fact, one Buchak Sarkis, an Armenian of Zeitun and principle witness for the prosecution charging the Bishop and others of the accused with connivance in the events which led to the disturbances, whose evidence was taken by the Marash Commission, was very firm, appeared and solemnly declared his alleged evidence to be "absolutely false and fabricated by the Commission."<sup>18</sup>

The Bishop's defense was based mainly upon the allegation that the trouble had been created and fomented by the Governor of Marash in the hope of advancement. "In corroboration of the preconceived hostility of Salib Fash against the Zeitun people, the accused asserted, moreover that during the summer preceding the disturbances [1890] he purposely sent into their districts a Government [Armenian] doctor on a vaccination tour armed with lymph and that of the four hundred children vaccinated not one survived."<sup>19</sup>

This communication is an important one because it proves the irrational antagonisms that the Turkish authorities felt for the Christian communities, and which could lead them to such senseless acts.

Jago wrote again on April 22, 1892 to communicate the result of the sentences: the Bishop of Zeitun had been condemned to life imprisonment, the teacher to five years imprisonment, and the preacher to death.<sup>20</sup>

The Acting Consul at Aleppo, Mr. A. Catori, communicated to F.C. Ford that he had been privately informed that the prisoners could not be released until they again paid one hundred Turkish Luas "for bribes." He also said that H. E. Arif Pasha, the Governor General of Aleppo,

had invited the Bishop Fournous Negoghos to come to Aleppo, and two days after his arrival had had him arrested and placed in prison without apparent reason and without trial.<sup>21</sup>

Immediately after the trial, the Armenian prisoners entered into communication with the authorities of Great Britain, in the hope that action might be taken to secure their release from the Porte and a settlement of the tangled question of Zeitun. The first letter was written on the 5/17 August 1892 in which the tragic picture of the Zeitun population was sketched. The letter is one of the unique documents of this event.

The communication, address to Gladstone, the Prime Minister, after certain preliminaries, runs, "While Armenians were almost resigned to this condition which had become habitual [deprivation and torture] contenting themselves with the appeasements which from time to time the Porte pretended to grant them in order to protect them from the greed and tyranny of its officials whose conduct it sometimes appeared to be inspecting, England – following the Turco-Prussian War – demanded the improvement of the condition of the Armenians giving them to understand that their misfortune is not natural, thus opening their eyes awakening in them the hope of a better future, making them feel the reality of their unhappiness, arousing in them national sentiments and political passions in a manner which made them [the Armenians] detestable in the eyes of His Majesty who, clement by nature, is deceived by his favourites, such as the Dervishes, and the Rei ..... thereby Armenians attracting upon themselves numerous calamities by which the extreme fury of their Kurdish neighbours on the one side, and on the other the greedy ambition of the officials who derived keen pleasure in making the Armenians endure all kinds of indescribable oppression and outrages, treating them like slaves in a country recently conquered by barbarians.

"Your Excellency is aware that among the places exclusively inhabited by Armenians in the Aleppo Vilayet are our unfortunate highlanders of Zeitun and that the question of reforms in Armenia proposed and accepted by the European powers, was made in her [Armenia's] name in 1878-9. All the Valis, Muttesarifs, and Caimakhan who succeeded each other in Aleppo, Marash and Zeitun were given promotions, decorations and advancements in proportion to the fury employed by them in persecuting the poor Armenians of Zeitun, with the exception of the present Vali Arif Pasha who surpassed his predecessors in the execution of his deeds, not worrying about promotions or decorations, but aiming at obtaining gold, and thinking only of rapacity and amassing wealth despite the poverty of the inhabitants; at the same time he served politics and the interests of his two protectors in Constantinople, who are Ridvan Posta – Head of a Municipality (Shehn Emine) and Dervish Posha, a Marshal favourite of the Pasha.

From the time of his arrival in Aleppo as governor about 2½ years ago, Arif Pasha went to Marash headquarters of the township of Zeitun, and began with Salik Pasha (the ex-Muttesarif of Marash) to search for plans of a revolt in Zeitun. It is there that they laid out the programme of the tragic-comedy which we are going to describe here below:

1. To remove from office the then Caimakhan of Zeitun, a brave and worthy man, and to replace him with a well known villain Kadry Bly, a downright scoundrel of Marash. To pardon [sic] regular bandits of the mountains and grant them freedom so that they continue their exploits to the detriment of the inhabitants and to give them officially money allowances in order to encourage them. But these measures not having been sufficient to create significant troubles, they resorted to the following:

2. To carry out, like a present day Herod, a massacre of the innocent: of 554 children between the ages of 2 to 10 years, all poisoned through a vaccination given freely according to the custom of the Country by the municipal chemist of the Government. These poor creatures have been robbed of the tender love of their mothers within the space of 5 to 10 days, out of a population of 5,000 persons. All these victims are boys, the girls having been spared. With the pretext of collecting overdue taxes, they mercilessly threw poor peasants into prisons, taking them away from harvesting work, and flogging them so violently that several of them died of it. At this time they arrested and with cruel beatings and allsorts of ill-treatment led to the prison of Marash, Sempad Purad, the only poet of the area, an intelligent and educated young man loved by all his contemporaries and who, coming after an absence of 20 years to see his old parents, whom he had left at the age of nine in order to go to school. The poor gentleman was arrested even before he entered the territory of the mountain, was treated as a vagrant despite his being accompanied by his two sons and his young wife who was in the family way; they were cruelly made to suffer of hunger and other necessities which tormented them for thirty six continuous hours, without being shown the charity of allowing the children to quench their thirst on the way from Albeatan to Marash. Furthermore they arrest Father Ghevant of Marash who by order of his superior was on a mission at Bayas, a small market-town at a distance of six days journey from Zeitun. He was seized in his own home with a young religious woman related to him and cast into prison while she is dragged into the company of women of ill-repute, and the brother of this poor woman was arrested at the same time as herself and is suffering in confinement without anybody having so far bothered to tell him what is his crime and without any formality. Thus the family of the poor priest which was composed of 12 persons is left without any support, having nobody to give them even their daily bread.

All these did not prove sufficient to arouse desires for rebellion and therefore they resorted to the following:

3. They had the bandits [released by them] assassinate a poor policeman named Osman and then claimed that Dadry Bey, the new wicked Caimakhan was obliged to desert his residence, alleging that the was not able to stay there any longer. Then they had 18000 cartridges fired upon the town-according to the statistics – thus causing several victims among the inhabitants, men, women and children. Then they had the troops pillage and deliver to sword and fire five Armenian villages and two Turkish villages, and thus, thanks to their diabolic underhand dealings they managed to give the Zeitun troubles the complexion of a revolt.

Whereupon, Arif Pasha began to turn into account the good services he rendered to the Government of his Royal Majesty the Sultan, by pacifying the so-called revolted [sic] town. This obtained him a good mark vis-à-vis the Palace for his protector Dervish Pasha a rank of Pasha for his other protector Ridvan, and a café and lucrative future for his own purse, but unfortunately for Arif Pasha and thanks to the integrity and uprightness of Mahomet Ali Pasha, a Major General and president of the Commission of Enquiry, appointed by order of the Sultan, Arif Pasha could not finish his tragedy entirely as he had planned it. Furious at not being

able to draw from this business the benefits he expected he avenged himself on all the persons who by their complaints and claims had caused the formation of this Commission of Enquiry, and the dismissal from the office of Salih Pasha, his accomplice and ex-Muttesarif of Marash, whom he had maintained in office for three months by his orders, despite the will of His Majesty who had kindly ordered the dismissal of this tyrant from office. During these three additional months when Salik Pasha was kept in office, Arif Pasha was able to move the scene to Aleppo where he has a direct influence on the so-called Justice-Adile; it is then that through the Aleppo Assize Court (sorry! I should have called this a gathering of adventurers and executioners), he was able to sentence to life imprisonment in a fortress one of the undersigned Archbishop Garabed of Zeitun, and to cast in prison the other undersigned, Archbishop Negoghos of Marash, to pass the death sentence on the above mentioned Father Ghevant and keep the religious woman related to him among prostitutes, also to condemn to 5 years imprisonment in a fortress the above mentioned schoolmaster Fempad Furad; to condemn 7 other Zeitunians to death and 10 others to forced labour for life, another to 10 years, 4 years to 8 years and 18 others to 5 years of imprisonment. Let us add to these, 8 other martyrs killed in prison by ill-treatment, a total of 51 persons, victims of the ambition and intrigue of the Vali and Aleppo.

As a consequence of this terrorizing, he had been able to extort money from people he “acquitted” and who were perhaps entirely innocent. He had received 406 gold sovereigns to date from persons “acquitted” and another 2124 from affluent persons who were designated “suspects” so that “suspicion” might be lifted from them. To be added to this, was what Arif Pasha received daily from Armenians who were brought before him and who were anxious to avoid arrest.

“We therefore come to beg your Excellency” the petition ended, “to make it possible for our complaints to reach the throne of His Majesty the Sultan our Lord and Master, and to make him understand the true situation of the Zeitunians by setting out ways of clement and wise conducted demanded by the circumstances, so that peace may return to this town.” The letter was sent from Aleppo Prison, and dated 5/17 August 1892. Francis Clare Ford was informed by the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs that the prisoners would be afforded an opportunity of appealing to the Higher Court in Constantinople against the sentence which had been passed against them.”<sup>22</sup>

The other prisoners also had hopes with regard to their situation, yet the hope was of a peculiarly debilitating kind. The promises handed out by the Porte remained unfulfilled. Neither was an Imperial Pardon granted nor a mixed Commission set up, and the absence of both was tantamount to a conformation legalization of the sentences by the High Court of Constantinople. “Amongst us too a priest condemned to death still lives in prison in contradiction of sentences confirmed. Consequently it would seem incontrovertible truth that the only object of the sublime Porte can be to torture us with delusive hope.”<sup>23</sup>

The prisoners implored Lord Roseberry for official intervention by the British Government which “has never been refused to innocent Protestant Armenians condemned.”<sup>24</sup>

From a document F.O. 78/4683 dated 16<sup>th</sup> May 1894 and signed by Philip Currie it would appear to have transpired that the British Consul at Aleppo, Mr. Block, called upon the Grand Vizier and mentioned to his Highness that the case of the Armenian Bishop of Zeitun and Marash had been brought to the notice of Her Majesty’s government by persons

who sympathized with the prisoners on account of their age and infirmity, and suggested that it might be possible through the clemency of the Sultan, to obtain mitigation of their sentences. The Grand Vizier informed Mr. Block that the Porte had noticed that numerous questions had been asked in the House of Commons with regard to these prisoners.<sup>25</sup>

It would certainly appear that nominally at least the British Government recognized the serious character of these imprisonments, which, trivial in themselves might cause grave repercussions within the Armenian nation at a time when national feelings were running high. Besides, the disturbances at Zeitun could well mark a new era of massacres and in general, savage discrimination against the Christian communities in the Ottoman Empire. The matter reached the Turkish press which sought to justify the action in an article in the paper *Saadet*, 7<sup>th</sup> October 1890. The tenor of the article was hysterical and amazingly biased. It averred that of late some members of the Armenian community had taken to creating disorder on every little pretext. The Turkish Authorities could not reconcile such “evil tendencies” with their primary duties as subject, and the article refers to “the well known and dispositions of its [the Armenian community’s] members”, their “seditious publications” and the existence of “Sedition mongers” within their ranks.

The article contradicts itself by affirming on the one hand, the utter political insignificance of this minority, and on the other the fact that strong measures had had to be taken against them. “For it is as clear as daylight that those people can speak and write, and their intentions are bad.”<sup>26</sup>

So literacy is a crime?

“Any ignorant stranger,” the article reads, “has only to go out into the highways and byways to meet with evidence of the Government’s paternal treatment of the Armenians.”<sup>27</sup> It is strange that reports totally contradictory to the above statement should have flooded out of Armenia every since the advent of literacy among the people. The article continues by deploring the bid among the Armenians for national independence, and advises that “the best thing that the community could do would be to be faithful and loyal like other Mussulman fellow-subjects, and give up all disorder and sedition.” How possible this course could be in the face of such intense discrimination, the article did not indicate. In fact, it was a complete evasion of the central issue, i.e., the reason for the massacres, and more particularly the disturbances around Zeitun, and proved nothing less than a weakness of a corrupt government in the Ottoman Empire.

Neither was Zeitun the only instance of the Turks’ imprisonment of clergymen. A year later (1894) we find two other Bishops imprisoned: Bishop Hadjin and Bishop Arabgir.<sup>28</sup>

According to Sir Philip Currie’s Statement, he had been informed by Her Majesty’s Consul at Erzeroum that the Bishop of Arsbgin had been an active member of the Revolutionary and had been one of the principal causes of the disturbances in Arabgir and the neighbouring areas. According to the following document a Mr. Schwarr in the House of Commons had asked “the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is able to communicate the results of the renewed efforts which Her Majesty’s Ambassador at Constantinople has been desired to make on behalf of the Armenian Archbishops of Marsh and Zeitun and the Bishops of Hadjin and Arabgir. Whose liberation is claimed on the ground that they have been unjustly punished.”

“Whether success has attended the efforts of Sir Philip Currie to obtain the release of prisoners detained without trial in the prisons of Aleppo, Livas, Angora, Van Yuzgat, Adana and Sinope.”

“And whether in view of the frequent representations in this House and elsewhere of the position of these untried prisoners the Government will lay upon the Table of the House, further papers giving information as to the steps taken on behalf of the Armenians in Turkey.”<sup>29</sup>

The above statement also names Bishop Hadjin as a comparatively unknown man, but Philip Currie promised to include his name in any representations he would make to the Porte on behalf of the Bishops of Zeitun and Marash.<sup>30</sup>

R. Graves, the Consul for Kurdistan, informed Philip Currie in his report dated 30<sup>th</sup> April 1894 that he had been privately informed that the Acting Bishop of Marash and Abbot of St. Garabed Monastery after a year’s detention (since 1893) in the Betlis Prison had been sentenced to five years imprisonment for “seditious incitement” of the Armenian population at Boulanik and Melazgerd.<sup>31</sup>

Henry D. Barnham, the Consul at Aleppo, forwarded the list of the Armenians imprisoned, and acquainted Sir Philip Currie that according to Archbishop Garabed’s letter the Sultan had twice granted a general Amnesty by which they were all entitled to benefit. Those among them who had been unable to purchase their liberty, had been excluded from the benefit of this Amnesty through the representative of local authorities.<sup>32</sup> It seems that the one prerequisite for the liberations of the so call political prisoners was that they should have sufficient money to buy their way out. Such was the basis of the legal system of the Turkish Empire.

It was common for the Armenians in the provinces to be accused of various political offences. The report of the Acting Vice Consul Thomas Boyadjian (also former Pastor of Diarbevie) to Consul Graves (dated 30<sup>th</sup> July 1892) from Kharpout indicated that the majority of those imprisoned if they had been put on trial, would have been able to prove their innocence. Most of them had been arrested either for no cause at all or for very trifling ones, such as having been found to possess books and songs, the circulation of which had lately been forbidden. The possessors had been probably unaware of the fact while others some twelve or thirteen years ago previously had written essays commemorating deeds of bravery of Armenians in times past; others again had written letters on business matters which were interpreted as having “secret meanings” by overzealous officials.

Mr. Boyadjian reported that orders had been received that no further arrests of Armenians were to be made on political charges of a trifling nature.<sup>33</sup>

An important letter was written from Arabgir in March 1892 signed by two hundred and fifty Armenian women of the town and sent to the President of the House of Commons. “It is more than a year that the Armenian population of this city has been subjected to constantly increasing and intolerable misery, as if the suffering of the past centuries at the hands of the Turkish officials were not sufficient, recently the Government has, with new vigour and increased fanaticism begun to torture the innocent and helpless Armenian Christians of this district by representing the same to the Sublime Porte as a turbulent and unsafe element . . . The law is the caprice of the wicked officials who as mentioned above are inflicting great misery on the Armenian Community; the Government is acting so arbitrarily that we can say that we are being, so to speak, in a state of siege.” The women complain that their Bishop and other notables who had shown some vigour in reformation had been arrested without any evidence of their supposed crimes, and, without trial, summarily dealt with as political suspects.

All means of communication had been barred to them, and the telegraphic office refused to forward any telegram of the nature of complaints, even though addressed to the Sultan, with the result that they were unable to send petitions. The only petition they did manage to despatch never reached its destination at all.

Hundreds of Armenians were languishing in the prisons of Kharpout, victims of intrigue and blackmail. The Government hirelings under pretext of searching for “forbidden” books and

manuals would go through the individuals every possession and carry off what they pleased. More than five hundred houses had thus been subjected to search, and though they had been reduced to shambles, nothing had been found in them.

The Christian religion too was forever being publicly insulted by the Mohammedans, who obviously suffered no punishment for this. They were in a desperate position in a country where innocence is detested, and where despotism and fanaticism are the truly reigning powers.

“Our priests, our teachers, the more or less successful and influential members of our community, our youths and our religious and educational institutions are all subject to groundless suspicion and constant persecution. In a word our fathers, brothers, husbands and sons have not one moment’s safety and comfort, and it is impossible for them to attempt such a petition without great risk and as the Government has not as yet begun to imprison or exile women in this district for political causes, we in the last extremity of our misery, herewith apply to your Honourable assembly and with piteous cry we beseech, that the Government of the British Empire would as a Christian power kindly interest Herself in our cause and please deliver us from the imminent danger that threatens to annihilate soon our existence.”<sup>34</sup>

Side by side with the purely secular life of the Armenian people, there existed a religious dialectic power which forever sought to curb over indulgence or misguided zeal, at the same time, endeavouring to raise the people out of their misery. One of the most important bodies was the Evangelical Church which was doing its utmost, as a report from the Evangelical Alliance claimed, to raise the minds, morals and life of the people. It claimed to have been eminently successful, especially at Parsoven where there was a Christian College for young men with American and Armenian professors, the Anatoba College with a Dr. Herrick for president. In connection with this college Professor Thoumaian, who was also a pastor and Mr. Kayayan, were teachers. These men were at the head of the Evangelical religious revival with the report alleged to have taken place in the district.

“The Turkish Government, however, for some time, have regarded with jealousy the progress in education and general intelligence, which is witnessed in the Christian race and which has resulted from the work of the Protestant Christian Missionaries. Especially have they viewed with growing alarm, the manner in which the Protestant movement is gaining ground in connection with Anatoba College. No doubt the Turks believe there is an insurrectionary movement among the Armenian people; but unquestionably the persecution at bottom is a religious one.”<sup>35</sup>

It had often happened that sermons and speeches having not the least reference to political affairs, had been interpreted by them as if they had. The new movement was regarded, willfully or ignorantly, as a revolutionary one while a sermon preached on the text, “Awake, thou that sleepest” was supposed to be an incitement to revolt. Towards the close of the previous year thousands of innocent people had been cast into prison and a vast amount of suffering entailed on their families. Some four hundred had been ultimately reserved for trial.

This was the state when according to Dr. Herrick, about the middle of January, one Nusref Pasha, wholly illiterate and an ex-brigand, Chief of the Gendarmerie of the Province had arrived at Marsovan and had begun his work of terrorizing the people by ransacking Armenian houses and making new arrests at the same time threatening to search the College and destroy it. Presently, Professor Thoumaian and Mr. Kayayan were arrested.

On the first of February the threats of the Governor materialized and the College was set on fire, one building being wholly destroyed.

After languishing in prison where many of them were also tortured, some sixty out of the four hundred prisoners, one of them a woman, and including Professor Thoumaian and Mr. Kayayan, were brought to a trial and condemned on suborned evidence and forged documents.

“Some were sentenced to actual death, and others to terms of imprisonment varying from two to fifteen years—a sentence far more hideous and horrible than death for the terrors and torture of a Turkish prison surpass description and speedy death were far preferable.

“At present these sentences have to be confirmed by the Court of Appeal which simply means a review of the case—it does not necessarily mean of the evidence—by the officials who are directly responsible to the Sultan who will simply determine what he decides and commands. It is certain therefore the sentences which the Turkish Government has been at infinite pains to secure will be ruthlessly carried out, unless sufficient pressure be brought to bear upon his Majesty.”<sup>36</sup>

A communication from A.J. Arnold, the Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance was sent to Rustom Pasha, the Ambassador for the Sultan, in which it expressed its aims and sympathies. The letter is dated 20<sup>th</sup> February 1894. The Evangelical Alliance disapproved of the present agitation, carried on by Mr. Thoumaian and others.<sup>37</sup>

The Evangelical Alliance purported to avoid all interference in political affairs, never intervening in any case of persecution barring the specifically religious. It was because sources had been insistent as to the innocence of Thoumaian and Kayayan that the Alliance had interposed with strong pleas addressed both to the English and Turkish Governments. As a result the two men, it would seem had been freed.

The aim of the Alliance is contained in the following paragraph: “It has no missionaries in Armenia or elsewhere. It is an organization composed of individual members of all Evangelical Churches and in all parts of the World. Our justification for pleading as we have done on various occasions, with Sovereigns and Governments, in favour of Religious Liberty is that we are not only interested in the recurring of liberty for every man to worship God according to his conscience, but also that ours is the only organized Body for expressing the sympathy and the mind of the Christian Churches of all Denominations and of various countries.”<sup>38</sup>

There had indeed, the letter continued, been religious reforms in the Turkish Empire in the forms of the Hathy Hamayoun and other Fermans of the Sultan; and in almost every case where complaints had been lodged on behalf of the Protestant Christians in the Turkish Empire, the difficulties had been of the creation of local officials and rarely by the Central Government. For numerous reasons however, the prevailing agitation might imperil unjustly many Christians, the Evangelical Alliance affirming simultaneously that it would not plead in any case of obvious sedition.

In every case of alleged religious persecution, two courses were taken; first, to ascertain the actual facts from reliable witnesses and agents (of whom there were many in all parts of the world), second, to appeal privately to the Government in question, for redress of the grievance.

The letter is indicative of an extremely rational attitude on the part of this Episcopal organization.<sup>39</sup> While it admits the existence of religious persecution, it does not blame the Central Government directly; it appeared to be an extremely stabilizing influence in those places where it operated.

From a despatch of Consul Graves to Sir A. Nicolson, it transpired that the Turkish Government’s military authorities had awakened to a sense of the need for restraining the lawlessness of the Kurds in the Melazgerd district. The Chief of one of the factions had been arrested and was presently to undergo court-martial. There had also been another incident of Armenians reputedly ill-treating an innocent Kurd, whom they accused of having stolen some corn. As a consequence, there was an attack on the village by 130 armed horsemen, with the resulting slaughter of men and women. Though this was scarcely justified, “his Excellency seemed quite satisfied with it and spoke in strong terms of the treacherous and rebellious spirit of the Armenians, and the necessity of teaching them a lesson.” This hardly boded well for the Armenian community because until that time, the Vali had appeared favourably disposed towards the Armenians. It was most likely that he had been issued instructions as to his future policy rather than that he had

initiated such a policy himself. The situation was very nearly identical throughout the South of Armenia. We are mainly concerned with this area, because it was normally the focal point of Anglican activity and the unsettled conditions hampered the effective continuance of reformation upon what lines had been formerly possible.

This then was the picture in the provinces of Southern Armenia. It was one of almost universal iniquity, which had for its basis hysterical religious hatreds, and complete disregard for the obligations imposed upon Turkey by the Treaty of Berlin.

By the 17<sup>th</sup> of February 1896, some of the European Powers had remonstrated more or less seriously with the Ottoman Government against the use of force to compel Christians to change their faith.

In each case the reply of the Ottoman Government was a flat denial of the facts. Since the crimes had not been committed in cities where there were European Consuls to report on them, denial of the allegations was impossible to counter.<sup>31</sup>

While the Ottoman Government denied the facts, early in January local officials of the provinces of Kharpout and Diarbekir sent orders to the recently “converted” villages that on no account were the people to admit that they had “become” Mohammedans if they were interrogated. These people were informed that death would be the penalty for any complaint of coercion. There were fifteen thousand of these forced converts in the province of Kharpout alone, and about forty thousand of them in the whole region eliminated by the massacres. A sensible course at this time would have been for the European Powers to send a Commission through the provinces to learn the real facts, and if the Commission could have persuaded people that they would not be betrayed to the Turks, it would have been found that they were pleading for relief from the servitude of a detested alien religion. If the Powers had demanded that the Ottoman Government issue a proclamation condemning these forced conversions, and giving the victims an opportunity to return to their original faith, all of them would certainly have rejoined the Armenian Church.<sup>32</sup>

Even at this date information from several parts of the provinces of Siras, Kharpout, Diarbekir, Betlis and Van showed that forced conversions were still occurring. Week by week, threats of extermination continued. Every Friday was a day of terror for the Christians in the provinces, as constant pressure was exerted upon them. In the country districts neither priest nor pastor dared venture out of hiding, for they would be killed instantly for “interfering” with the conversion of the people. In the villages Christian worship was generally prohibited throughout the six provinces of the reform scheme. In twenty eight villages in the district of Kharpout, there had been no Christian worship since the 1<sup>st</sup> of November. This abolition of ceremonial and service was part and parcel of the effort to extinguish Christianity.<sup>33</sup>

To the same end—the destruction of Christianity—the people were being deprived of their few remaining men of influence. The prisons of the chief cities of the various provinces were full of Armenians. Though even the most cowardly could see that in a population where the Muslims outnumbered the Christians by ten to one, where the Christians had been stripped of all their possessions and the Christian community decimated by massacres, there was not the slightest possibility of any seditious uprising. Yet the men who were reputed to have influence or to be or education were arrested and jailed, without charges being laid against them. They were simply imprisoned so that the communities at the whim of the Governor should be deprived of their leading minds. The people were thus left without their natural advisors, a prey to any enterprise that the petty officials or the Imams of the Muslim community chose to engage in.

Another indirect method of destroying the Christian communities in the provinces lay in the systematic debauching of Christian women as though to destroy their self-respect and undermine their religious ethic. At Tamzara in the district of Shaska Kara Hussar, in the province of Livias, all the men were killed in the massacres early in November, of a prosperous Armenian population of

fifteen hundred only about three hundred starving, half naked women and children remained. Trustworthy information said that the most horrible feature of their situation was that passing Mohammedan soldiery or civilian travelers attacked them and outraged them in their homes without hesitation or restraint. This continued for the three months after the completion of the massacres. Information from Mezere, the Seat of the Government in the province of Kharpout, dated the 27<sup>th</sup> of January, said that the same license to abuse Christian women existed in that province as well. Within sight and hearing of the Governor General's palace, young Mohammedans had broken into Christian houses by night to work their pleasure upon the women. These were not isolated incidents; they happened week after week until the women were reduced to the condition of public prostitutes without wills of their own.<sup>34</sup>

It was because these women were Christians and refused to change their religion that they were thus attacked and made the sport of every Muslim ruffian who chose to lay his hands upon them. Again, because these women were Christian, the Ottoman Government laughed at the infamies and rejected pleas for protection even when appealed to by the victims themselves, and refused to allow them to flee to some town where they might find refuge.<sup>35</sup>

In the past, it had been found that where there were foreign Consuls in Turkey, such attacks on the Christians of the land did not take place. If it was impossible to interest Governments in the defense of Christianity sufficiently to secure prompt intervention and halt the attempt to crush out Christianity in the Empire, at least it would be quite possible, with the minimum of trouble, to appoint Consuls in the principal cities of the Turkish provinces. The mere presence of a Consul would probably stop the worst of the infamies.

Another paper from Lambeth Palace marked Attacks on Christianity in Turkey, summarizes the whole situation.

“The massacres were accompanied by pillaging on such a scale that almost the entire Armenian agricultural population in the villages had been plundered of money, goods, food and clothing, implements and live stock. Their houses destroyed and they themselves left destitute.”

“In a territory some sixty thousand miles in area, an effort has been made and is now being made to extinguish Christianity among the Armenian race by destroying Church edifices, killing the clergy, and forcing the surviving members of their flocks in all places where foreign Consuls are not present to report the facts, to become Mohammedans. It now seems probable that a large part of those who have been killed in the country districts are martyrs, who have refused life at the price of denying their Lord.” Thousands of Armenian women had been swept into the homes of murderers threatened by instant death, while hundreds of others were being singly approached and put under pressure of the most ignominious threats which would be executed if they refused to deny their faith. The Armenian Church was on the brink of annihilation. “Unless Christendom acts instantly and overwhelmingly to arrest this infamy, this century of enlightenment will be marked in history as the one in which a Christian people was destroyed with the full knowledge and before the eyes of Christendom, no Christian nation being moved sufficiently by the spectacle to lift a hand to prevent it.”<sup>36</sup>

The final carefully prepared statistics revealed that 88 thousand, two hundred and forty three Armenians of whom ten thousand Protestants were murdered, and over half a million robbed of all their possessions, five hundred and sixty eight churches, eighty of them Protestant, were pillaged and destroyed and two hundred and eighty two others turned into mosques. The absurdity was that often the victims had only to repeat the Mohammedan Khalima (La illah, etc.) or lift a finger in a token of assent, for the knife to be lowered. Thus they became Moslems and wherever possible this “confession of faith” was ?????? by marriage to a Moslem. In the face of such fanaticism, some six hundred and forty six villages and fifty five priests turned to Islam. Only in a few places were British Consuls able to secure for the Christians, “converted” to Islam, freedom to re-embrace their

former religion. Buijek was just such an instance, the entire Congregation of about a thousand accepted Islam in the hour of danger, but through the intercession of the British were allowed to return to the Armenian Church.<sup>37</sup>

One thing was remarkable throughout the terrible persecution of the Armenians: their heroism. Many died as martyrs. The official number of Protestant ministers murdered rested at 25 and the number of Armenian Church priests massacred at one hundred and seventy five, all of them after unspeakable torture.

Immediately after the massacres petitions began arriving in England for relief measures. One such was sent on December 9<sup>th</sup>, 1895, from Constantinople. The subscriptions, it stated, which the Church had collected had gone directly to the Centres of Suffering. The Duke of Westminster had formed a committee, the funds from which were forwarded to the subcommittee at Constantinople of which a Mr. Whitehall was Chairman and Sir Philip Currie an honorary supervisor. From the committee the funds were forwarded through the missionaries, who also held the money collected locally by the Armenians.

“I wish that you could help force upon the minds of the public,” the appeal continues, “that no effective relief can be distributed in the villages without a special staff from abroad under the protection of the foreign Governments. Up to this moment, Turkey has made no utterance in condemnation of the massacre and plunder of the Armenians. Hence the provincial officials everywhere regard attempts to succour the starving as attempts to thwart the will of the Sultan . . . To give them bread or clothing is to encourage them not to become Mohammedans. This is therefore a crime to be repressed by all means in the hands of the officials. The lawfulness of carrying relief to the villages must be fought through somehow. It is fully as important as the collection of funds.”<sup>38</sup>

People were dying at the rate of six to ten a day in the large towns, and even in Van, among the refugees. In the villages where the people were left exposed and destitute, the death rate was probably much higher, in the absence of any local aid. The appeal invited young men willing to go out on an errand of mercy and who would be accompanied by local interpreters.

It was desired that the facts of the massacres, the chief incidents of which were listed, be published. The Armenian Church would also profit by the interest of the Bishop with a view to ensuring the attention of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Armenian Patriarch was to appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury. He was also advised to appeal to the Pope, but hesitated as it would almost certainly be understood as “implying encouragement to the scheme of uniting the Armenian Church with the Roman Church”; the natural inclinations of the Armenian Church lay much closer to the Anglican discipline than to the Roman, and it was therefore hoped that the possible generous sympathy emanating from the Anglican Church might exercise a powerful influence in the right direction.<sup>39</sup> It was therefore from the European Christians that succour and sympathy was expected. On the 20<sup>th</sup> of December 1895, the Archbishop of Canterbury received an appeal from G. Hagopian requesting him to receive a deputation from the Armenian residents in London, who would submit to him a review of the dreadful condition of the Christian population in Armenia and Anatolia.

The object of the Deputation was to enlist the more general and active sympathy of the Church of England and to see if at least some progress could be made in putting an end to the massacre of innocent men and women, and in accelerating relief measures to the Armenian nation. The letter ends, “I told them throughout these troubles that your silence was in no way due to any want of sympathy with the cause of the Christians in England more particularly of the Armenians.”<sup>40</sup>

But the Archbishop of Canterbury was willfully oblivious to the sufferings of the Armenian people. Either for fear of compromising his standing in the British Parliament, or out of misguided diplomacy, or perhaps because the absurd idea that this was a political and not a religious struggle,

he had at all times kept silent and refused to condemn the heinous crimes that were being perpetuated on the Turkish front. In fact, when the Archbishop of Canterbury sent a letter to the Marquis of Salisbury on January 4<sup>th</sup>, 1896, he writes, “Although I am sorry to trouble you at times of anxiety, yet your counsel of last year bore such fruit that I cannot but ask you whether it is possible that the Church could do good by any action or expression about Armenia. The Church is deeply moved at the crimes perpetuated, and at the threatened destruction of a Christian Church but keeps quiet because of the confidence that the best that England can do is being done.”<sup>41</sup>

“Hitherto there have been prayers for mercy there and for wisdom here, but if any step can be taken to give moral support on behalf of Armenia, the Church burns to take it.”<sup>42</sup>

This document fully reveals the intentions of the Archbishop. He asks “whether it is possible that the Church could do good,” but from what other quarter should aid most readily have been given and surely the very first body to take action should have been the Church. He then says, “[The Church] keeps quiet because of the confidence that the best that England can do is being done.” But what was England doing? And even if England in was “doing its best”, was this any reason that the Church should have abstained from action? Besides all the Archbishop is offering, and that grudgingly, is “moral support.” Surely support of a more tangible nature should have been forthcoming at the time and in the circumstances.

The “moral support” was provided by Rev. H. Lunn, General Editor of the Review of the Churches, who desired that the Archbishop give permission for his name to appear on an appeal which Lunn proposed to circulate to the Churches, that Holy Innocent’s Day be observed as a day of humiliation and prayer in memory of the massacres that Armenian had just seen.

But in Armenia the people were still suffering. As a result of the killing of the Armenian males, it happened that there remained probably one hundred thousand widows and orphans, robbed of all and threatened with death from cold and starvation.

The knowledge of all this misery, when it reached Europe, made it incumbent on Christians to organize relief measures. England, whose contribution hitherto had been in the nature of sympathy, was found by her treaty obligations, and by the close ties that existed between the respective Churches of the two countries, to act the Good Samaritan. The Anglo-Armenian Association, headed since 1876 by the ex-cabinet Minister Lord Bryce, in a futile bid to obtain political immunity for the Armenians, organized a relief fund composed of the Duke of Westminster, the Church historian J. Rendel Harris, societies, with whom the Swiss, English and Americans also cooperated. There was a great deal of work to be done as the children who had been reduced to a sad state by famine, cold and neglected, had to be nursed back to physical and mental health. The arrangements for their educations had also to be handled with great diplomacy, and were to be free from any tendency which would estrange them from the Mother Church, for the Armenian Church authorities were jealous and fearful lest in their downtrodden condition the people’s rights be flouted. At the same time, the Protestant foster parents took care to train the children committed to their care in the knowledge of the Scriptures. Another problem was to provide ways for these thousands of orphans to earn their livelihood later on in life. Great importance was attached to the teaching of trades such as carpentry, masonry and farming; workshops were attached to many orphanages, combined in many cases with extensive farms.

It was imagined that approximately ten years of this direct and expensive aid would suffice. However, the plundering and the ill-treatment of the Armenians did not cease, especially in the eastern sector, where it was found necessary not only to keep the old orphanages open but also to establish new ones.

Various other means were also made available to the people upon which to found new lives. Hundreds of wrecked houses were rebuilt, cattle and oxen were lent or given gratuitously, seed corn supplied, farming implements and tradesmen’s tools and supplies for shops provided.

It was clear that the Armenian nation was marvelously resilient, and recovered with great credit from the decimation of their race and properties. The Turks had failed but continued their tyrannous acts over the Armenians in Asia Minor, the original home of the Armenians. It was too early to hope that there would be no recurrence of the massacres. By 1907, the European Powers had shown that they were not willing to put themselves to any further inconvenience on behalf of the Armenians. Their ceaseless diplomatic negotiations had proved futile and the people were left to their fate. At the time Turkey was taken aback by the unequivocal condemnation of the Consuls and the philanthropists. Hence when diplomacy failed, even publicity was some safeguard for the oppressed. For this reason the Turks continued to be inimical to the presence of foreigners and missionaries in Turkey, and did not cease to intrigue against them. However, Americans, Englishmen and Germans had settled down in the remotest valleys from where they despatched reports abroad of every instance that disturbed the peace of the districts. But how long the peace of the Armenians was to last was uncertain.

How had Britain reacted to the tortures and massacres of the Armenian people?

The Press published an enormous amount of literature on the question. Pamphlets dealing with the degradation of the people, reports of speeches given by representatives, books written on the plight of the Armenians poured out.

The Anglo-Armenian Association whose founder was the R. Hon. James Bryce. The Association has been instrumental in carrying out motions in Parliament as is seen from the following extract. "It is noteworthy to remember that of the membership of the Association, Mr. Bryce, Sir Edward Gray and Mr. Levenson Gower were reelected to the House of Commons." As a result, there was great optimism that through these three members, England might be forced to carry out its obligations incumbent upon herself by the Cyprus convention.

One of the immediate results of the Association had been the despatch of a Mission for Armenia by the Sultan, after some correspondence between Sir E. Gray at the Foreign Office and Lord Roseberry. So by 1893, the Government could officially be said to have greater sympathy with the Armenian cause. Public attention had been brought to the massacres, to such a degree that an important pamphlet entitled The Cry of Armenia was published in 1895, which consolidated the reports on the situation and quoted from the expressions of sympathy of the British and other foreign politicians. The pamphlet is a useful one and is worth handling at some length.

The pamphlet reminds Britain of her treaty obligations in respect to the Berlin Conference. It was true that out of deference for Britain and the other countries of Europe privy to the signing of the Berlin treaty, the Turks had, for a time, mitigated their oppression of the Christians. But years had passed and the apparent disregard of the European countries including Britain spurred the Turks to double their anti-Christian activities. What had not been noticed before was that not only were the Armenian peasants butchered, but they were reduced to such straits that they were forced to leave their home towns and emigrate en mass.

Of course this projected contravention did not occur. The situation was more of the character sketched by the Oulpo of Argyll in his book Our Responsibilities for Turkey. Speaking of Mr. Gladstone, he says, "Political conditions have imposed on him a comparative silence on the conduct of our Government under two successive cabinets since the outbreak of the Turkish brutality in Armenia in 1894-95." The silence of which he speaks lies at the heart of the trouble. While there were many influential supporters of the Armenian movement, the fact was that Parliament was afraid of causing an European war if it intervened in Turkey. Hence the troubles in Armenia were allowed to fester and multiply, even though the basic question was not a political but rather a humanitarian one.

The Armenian people who looked to the British in the persons of the Church and the Government were to be disappointed. For essentially, the Anglican Church and Parliament were

two sides of the same coin. They both represented security for the Armenian people. Yet the Church could not grant material help at the time. Because of the peculiar character of the troubles, the Anglican Church was disposed regard them as a political matter and while Parliament did not seem opposed to this view (and one cannot in fairness accuse them of shifting the onus upon the Church) because the element of orthodoxy and the policy of non-intervention which Britain has always sought to pursue even in the face of treaty obligations, it was similarly debilitated.

It is hardly surprising that in the face of this anti-Christian activity in Turkey, that all missionary projects should cease; the Anglican "reformation" was centered around the southern provinces of Armenia where the massacres were concentrated. Religious welfare was out of the question, when temporal aid was slow and grudgingly given. In fact, the more one examines the question, the more apparent it was that the agitations in Armenia provided a convenient, if ghastly excuse for the Anglican Church to cover relations with the little "Armenian-Anglican" church, for the period during which the troubles were most intense.

Viewed in this light, it would seem that the responsibility of the British nation was more than might have at first appeared. Her responsibility lay not only in the demands of Christian charity which all European nations were, by their own professions, obliged to practice, but by being herself indirectly responsible for the state of affairs described, she was obliged to rectify her mistake. Again, it now appears more natural that the Armenian people should look to Britain for the aid she deserted. This is also why the appeals and petitions should in the main be directed to Britain and not to the other signatory powers of the Treaty.

As for the sessions in Parliament upon the question, they are too numerous to recall, but Gladstone delivered a memorable speech in the House of Commons on August 6<sup>th</sup>, 1895. Gladstone reviled the Turkish Government as "perhaps the worst of the fact of the earth." However Gladstones' speech was too diplomatic to prove of effectual use and little fruit was gleaned from the unanimous carrying of the resolutions. One point which Gladstone raised was debatable—the question of whether the Turkish government was pursuing a policy of a "deliberate determination to exterminate the Christians of that Empire". For Mr. Gladstone the point was moot. But it is sufficiently clear from the wealth of evidence we have to hand, that such was indeed the case and that mere religious fanaticism was the basis of all the sufferings in Armenia. Similarly non-committal was the view of the Archbishop of Canterbury. We find his Chaplain writing in September 1896, "the real portion of affairs can only be known to the Government and His Grace thinks that the only course for the public to take is to express its confidence in their action upon Christian and human principles . . . The Archbishop cannot but think that our wisest course is rather to support them with our expression of confidence in their justice." Here we have the same evasion of the issue that we have noted on so many occasions. The Archbishop of Canterbury had been consistently lacking in the courage to speak for the Armenian people, especially when the case pivoted upon the extermination of a Christian denomination. Yet if the source from which aid might most reasonably have been expected was not responsive, it was certainly not the case with public opinion; there was no dearth of organizations founded to help the Christians in Turkey. We have the minutes of one such organization, the League in Aid of the Christians of Turkey. A Mr. G. Mussolini, a Greek Christian from Smyrna addressed the assembled gathering, which included several influential persons. He spoke of the misapprehension under which people in Britain and abroad had been labouring, namely that the Porte was susceptible to foreign opinion and capable of improvement as a result. Thus Britain, in the Crimean war, had been led to support the Porte; the events of the preceding twenty years had shown, however, that as Lord Palmeston had indicated as long ago as 1865, the British had been foolish in trusting the honour of Turkey without enacting guarantees. Under the existing Moslem law, Christians were stripped of all political and civil rights. Taxation for instance was of the nature of that existing in France under the "Ancien Regime",

though worse. "The taxes were farmed out and the farmer got the money in anyway, and as often as he pleased and he had the police and soldiers at his beck and call to help him in raising the taxes." Several other instances of Turkish corruption were offered, their immediate cessation of which formed the motion of the meeting. As had been stated in several preceding articles, England had spent a great sum of money on the defense of Turkey against Russia, and it was time that it did the same upon defense of the Christian against the Turks.

This would not entail an European war as Lord Bryce mentioned in a letter published in the Times of Sept. 25<sup>th</sup>, 1896. He says, ". . . the reign of terror . . . must ultimately bring about the interference of some at least of the Power(s) under circumstances far more likely to lead to a conflict than would the removal from the throne he has disgraced of the author of these misdeeds," deluding the Porte that in such an event, it would be safe, and its peace maintained by Britain. "The convention is a sham," the Canon wrote, "because every sane person in England knows that no British government, Tory or Liberal, would move a single soldier or ship to defend Turkey in case of Russian aggression. In fact in 1860, a precedent had been established in Lebanon to show the facility with which it was possible for the two conceited powers to force upon the Porte their will."

For a slightly different view of the situation, let us turn to the Westminster Gazette of Dec. 18<sup>th</sup>, 1894. The article blames the massacres, not upon the Kurds, but upon the Turkish regular troops, commanded by Turkish Officers in accordance with orders issued from the Porte. The article continues with the allegation, as startling as it is novel that "the crime at Sasoon lies primarily at the door of England. It is one of the many disastrous results of that 'Peace of Honour' which the English Government represented by Lord Beaconsfield claimed to have brought back from Berlin in 1878." As evidence of this stern allegation, the article gives the fact that it was England alone, which "destroyed the security which Russia had extorted from the Turkish Government at San Stefano and substituted for the sterling guarantee of Russia, the worthless paper-money of Ottoman promises." The Treaty of San Stefano conferred explicit obligations upon Russia which they could easily have carried out. Before the Treaty, Russian troops had occupied parts of Armenia. If the 'Turks' share of the bargain had not been carried out, it was a simple matter to revert to the pre-existing conditions. The British plenipotentiaries, however, appeared to regard this as establishing for Russia a protectorate over Armenia and therefore insisted in substituting the 61<sup>st</sup> article of the Berlin Treaty. England was therefore responsible in many ways for the Armenian plight; by destroying the Russian guarantee of the treaty of San Stefano, by the inept management of the Berlin Conference and lastly, by the Cyprus Convention which "established an illegal British protectorate over the Asiatic dominions of the Sultan."

In the Daily News of Jan. 12<sup>th</sup>, 1895, comes an articles which ahs an insight into the working methods of the Turkish government. The Armenian massacres of the previous year had brought "the same sort of ridiculous and preposterous denials with which the Bulgarian atrocities were greeted." Nothing had happened in Sasoon at all, while others who admitted the truth of the allegations in part at least, were astonished that the Kurds and Turks should have been so long suffering on tolerating the excesses of the "Turbulent" Armenians. The Commission appointed by the Sultan was purely nominal; it consisted of Turks and Mohammedans and as such was limited in its function as compatibility among the Moslems, and especially Moslems under Turkish rule were hardly the order of the day. The Commission in fact has only been a grudging concession for England, France and Russia. Yet if the Commission was worthless could the same be said of the consular reports which flooded the British press? What conceivable motive could the consuls have for falsifying the facts?

The truth was that as Canon MacColl pointed out in a letter dated 1894, that for every massacre perpetrated in Armenia, the Porte was responsible directly or indirectly, in a similar way to the Bulgarian massacres which had been proved to have been executed under orders from the Porte.

Secondly, the appointed Commission was “an utter farce, having no other object than that of showing dust in the eyes of civilized Europe. Of course the commission will exonerate the real criminals, and throw the blame on innocent parties. How can anyone believe in such an impudent imposture?” Besides, it was well known that by Turkish law, no Moslem could give evidence against another whilst Christian evidence against a Moslem was disallowed.

The solution to the problem was to be found in a concerted action on behalf of the Armenians by England and Russia. Canon MacColl also called for England to be released from the Anglo-Turkish convention which was clearly an irrelevance, according to him. By this convention, England was forced to repulse any Russian aggression in Turkey, thus, in the Spectator on the 15<sup>th</sup> of the same month, had appeared an important article which was entitled “The Armenian claim on Europe.” It reads, “We do not quite understand the sort of hesitation expressed by some of our contemporaries as to the right of the British Government or any other government in Europe to interfere for the protection of the Armenians. That right rests not only upon positive treaty recognized and quoted by the oppressing power, but upon a claim much broader, and to our minds more definite even than that.” The article went on to illustrate at length that “her consent, tacit or expressed is essential to every great change made in the two subordinate continents,” and therefore the “claim to put Egypt straight for the benefit of Europe, involves to our minds the obligation to put Armenia straight for the Benefit of the Armenians.” The article called for protection of the Armenian people, even if it required an exercise of force. The Powers should have called for punishment for the past, and security for the future, since from any aggressive action they should take there would be no risk of an European war. If the objection that the Russian government under its professions of disinterestedness would only be too willing to acquire now territory on the strength of any invasion of the Turkish empire, then it was better, the article stated that the land in part should be under Russian domination rather than the execrable government of the Turks. “If the two powers act together and guarantee a modest tribute; Armenian can be enfranchised without a war; and if Russia dreading the rise of an independent Armenia refuses to act, our duty will be to apply the physical pressure which liberated Thessaly without a single shot being fired.” This article is an important one because it does not hesitate to use the words “physical pressure” a course which politicians and even active supporters of the Armenian cause, have shrunk from mentioning. It was the only plausible means by which England, at this juncture could aid the Armenians, merely political representations having been notoriously useless. Not only would it be a just action but one that it was incumbent upon Britain to undertake. “It would be folly to attempt to ignore the significance of these facts. As we have said, they justify Her Majesty’s Government in making the strongest representations to the Porte. But this country ought not to be left to make an isolated remonstrance.” By one of the articles of the Treaty of Berlin, the Porte undertook “To carry out without delay the improvements and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians and then to guarantee their security against the Circassians and the Kurds,” and promised further, “to periodically make known the steps taken to this effect to the powers who will superintend their application;” this stipulation remains practically a dead letter. It was folly for the Turkish Government in the circumstances, the article added, to invite the possibility of intervention, if the State of friendly relations between England and Russia was to be taken into consideration, as these two countries were found to be at one in any views they hold on the situations.

The Armenian movement was not without sympathy from higher quarters. On his 85<sup>th</sup> birthday, Mr. Gladstone, the ex-Premier, expressed “his sympathy” with the sufferings of the Armenian people. With respect to the Bulgarian massacres, he says, on that occasion, “I remained silent because I had full confidence that the Government of the Queen would do its duty and I still entertain that confidence.” This was the general political attitude that was held in respect of the

Armenian question at this time. The politicians were clearly not “silent” by the year 1895, and yet their representations in Parliament and outside had little effect in promoting effective action on the part of the British. “Such a Government,” Gladstone continued, “as that which can countenance and cover the perpetration of such outrages is a disgrace in the first place to Mahomet the Prophet whom it professes to follow, that it is a disgrace to civilization at large, and that it is a curse to mankind.”

## **Bibliography:**

### i) Primary Sources:

- Anderson, M.A., The Eastern Question, 1774-1923, New York 1966.
- Argyll, G.D., What the Turks Are and How We Have Been Helping Them, Glasgow 1876.
- Armenia, (n.n.) The Armenians and The Eastern Question, London 1876.
- Arpee, Leon, A History of Armenian Christianity, New York 1946.
- Atiyee, A.S., A History of Eastern Christianity, London 1968.
- Bechesnilian, K., In Bonds, an Armenian's Experiences, London 1896.
- Bourne, K., The Foreign Policy of Victorian England, 1830-1902, London 1970.
- Bryce, J., Transcaucasia and Ararat, London 1877.
- Bryce, J., Transcaucasia with Supplement on the Armenian Question, London 1896.
- Burney, C., and Lang, D.M. The Peoples of the Hills. Ancient Ararat and Caucasus, London 1971.
- Buxton, C.R., Turkey in Revolution, 1876-1909, London 1909.
- Buxton, M., and H.J. Travel and Politics in Armenia, London 1941.
- Charles, R., The Holy Orthodox Eastern Churches, Pamphlets on Easter Churches, 1866-1900, February 27, 1896.
- Clogg, R., The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol. XIX No. 1, April 1968.
- Cohen, A., The Turkish and Pan-Turkish Ideal, Constantinople 1917.
- Creasy, E.S., History of The Ottoman Turks, London 1878.
- Davey, Richard, The Sultan and His Subjects, Vols. I-II, London 1897.
- Davis, E.J. (Rev.) Life in Asiatic Turkey, London 1879.
- Der-Nersesian, Sirarpi The Armenians, London 1969.
- Dowling, T.E., The Armenian Church, London 1910.

- Dwight, H.G.O. (Rev.) Christianity in Turkey: A Narrative of the Protestant Reformation in the Armenian Church, London 1854.
- Fanshawe, T. (Rev.) Turkish Armenia and Eastern Asia Minor, London 1881.
- Gabrielian, M.C., Armenia – a Martyr Nation, London 1918.
- Gladston, Stephen, The Armenia Question, London 1894.
- Gobat, Samuel, His Life and Work, London 1884.  
Bishop of Jerusalem
- Green, F.D., The Rule of the Turk. Revised Edition of the Armenian Crisis, New York, 1896.
- Green, F.D., The Armenian Crisis and the Rule of the Turk, London 1894-95.
- Greek, J.K. (Rev.), Leavening The Levant, Boston 1916.
- Gregory, D.S., The Crime of Christendom, or, The Eastern Question, New York 1896.
- Hamlin, C., Among The Turks, London 1878.
- Hechler, W.H. The Jerusalem Bishopric (Documents), London 1883.
- Hodgetts, E.A.B., Round About Armenia, London 1896.
- Hopkins, J. Castell, The Sword of Islam or Suffering Armenia, Brantford and Toronto, 1896.
- Issaverdens, J. (Rev.) The Armenian Church, its History. Armenia: Geography, History, Church and Literature, Venice 1877.
- Khrlopiian, D., Dedicated to the Centenary of the Middle East's Armenian United Evangelical Church Institution, 1846-1946, Vol. I, Beirut 1950, (In Armenian: Vosgemadian).
- Knight, E.F., The Awakening of Turkey, London 1909.
- Lanil, E., Armenia and the Armenian People, London 1890.
- London Anglo-Armenian Association "The Case for the Armenians", London 1893
- Lynch, H.F.B., The Armenian Question, London 1894.

- MacColl, M.A.  
(Rev.) England's Responsibility Towards Armenia, London and New York, 1895.
- MacColl, M.A.  
(Rev.) The Sultan and the Powers, London 1896.
- Margossian, S., The Situation of the Western Armenians at the End of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century (in Armenian), Erevan 1968.
- Marriott, J.A.R., The Eastern Question: A Study of European Diplomacy, (First ed. Oxford, 1917 and Fourth ed. Oxford 1951).
- Nalbandian, L., The Armenian Revolutionary Movement, University of California Press, Berkley and Los Angeles, 1963.
- Nansen, Fridtjof, Armenia and the Near East, London 1928.
- Nazarbek, A., Through the Storm: Pictures of Life in Armenia, London 1899, (Trans. L.M. Elton).
- Ormanion, M., Azghabadoum (Story of the Nation), Jerusalem 1937.
- Ormanion, M., The Church of Armenia, London 1955.
- Richter, J., A History of Protestant Missions in the Near East, London 1910.
- Rolin-Taeguemyms,  
M.G. Armenia, the Armenians, and the Treaties, London 1891.
- Sanjian, A., The Armenian Communities in Syria under Ottoman Dominion, Harvard University Press 1965.
- Telfer, C.B., Armenia and its People, London 1891.
- Tibawi, J.L., British Interests in Palestine, 1800-1901, Oxford University Press 1961.
- Toynbee, A.J., Armenian Atrocities, the Murder of a Nation, London, New York, Toronto 1915.
- Toynbee, A.J., The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire Documents, London 1916.
- Vartanian, H., The Emancipation Problem of the Western Armenians, (in Armenian), Erevan 1967.
- Wintle, W., Armenia and its Sorrows, (Third ed.), London 1896.

ii) Secondary Sources:

- Abbott, G.F., Turkey – Greece and the Great Powers, London (n.d.)
- Abrahamian, Abel  
(Rev.) The Church and Faith of Armenia, London 1920.
- Andrew, A.W., A Missionary Biography, London 1883, Joseph Barclay (1831-1881).
- Armenia, (n.n.) Historical Sketch of Armenia and the Armenians, London 1896.
- Barton, J.L., Daybreak in Turkey, Boston 1908.
- Bayly, E.B., A Brief Memoir of Ida Mellinger, London 1900.
- Bryce, V., The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-16, Documents presented to Viscount Grey of Fallodon, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. By Viscount Bryce, with a Preface of Viscount Bryce, London 1916.
- Buxton, Harold  
(Rev.) The Armenian Church, London 1919.
- Buxton, Harold  
(Rev.) The English and Armenian Churches, London 1929.
- Clarke, H., Journal of Statistical Society of London, London 1865.
- Davidson, R.  
and Benham, W. Life of Archbishop Campbell Tait, London 1891
- Denton, W. (Rev.), Life in Asiatic Turkey, London 1879.
- Dwight, H.G.O.  
and Smith, Eli. Missionary Researches in Armenia, London 1834.
- Farley, J.L., Modern Turkey, London 1872.
- Farley, J.L., Turks and Christians, London 1876.
- Fortescue, E.F.K. The Armenian Church, London 1872.
- Gregor, N.T., History of Armenia, London 1897.
- Hepworth, G.H.  
(Rev.) Through Armenia on Horseback, London 1898.

- Hovannisian, R.G., Armenia on the Road to Independence, California University Press, Los Angeles 1967.
- Issaverdens, J. (Rev.) The Sacred Rites and Ceremonies of the Armenian Church, Venice 1888.
- Johnson, C.F.D., The Armenians, London 1916.
- Joseph, B., The People of Ararat, London 1926.
- Lidgett, E.S. An Ancient People: Short Sketch of Armenian History, London 1897.
- Morgenthau, H., The Tragedy of Armenia, London 1918.
- Mussabini, N.G., Address and Speeches on the Condition of the Christians in Turkey, London 1876.
- Newman, T., The Christians Relief Proposed by the Powers in Europe, London 1896.
- Pears, E., Forty Years in Constantinople 1873-1915, (Second ed.), London 1915.
- Perkins, J., Missionary Life in Persia, Boston 1861.
- Ramsey, W.M., The Historical Geography of Asia Minor, London 1890.
- Smith, R.B., The Eastern Question: Turkey and Russia, London 1876.
- Stock, E., History of the Church Missionary Society, Vols. I, II, III, IV, London 1899.
- Tchobianian, A., The People of Armenia, London 1914.
- Tisdall, W.C., The Conversion of Armenia to the Christian Faith, London 1897.
- Vartoughian, A.P., Armenia's Ordeal: Sketch of the Main Feature of the History of Armenia, New York 1896.
- Wigram, W.A.  
(Rev.) The Cradle of Mankind, London 1914.
- Williams, W.L., Armenia, Past and Present, London 1916.
- Williams, W.L., Armenia's Tragic Story, London 1916.

## Endnotes:

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Cyrus Hamlin, Among the Turks, London 1878, p. 94.
- <sup>2</sup> Appendix 18.
- <sup>3</sup> Appendix 19.
- <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, In the absence of the Marquis of Salisbury the letter was signed by T. Pauncefote.
- <sup>5</sup> L.P. Benson official letters, Vol. 79, ff. 277-321, Foreign 1889.
- <sup>6</sup> The Times, 29<sup>th</sup> May, 1889.
- <sup>7</sup> The Times, 13<sup>th</sup> April, 1889.
- <sup>8</sup> Besides the Association Patriotique Armenienne, London, there were several relief organizations in London and elsewhere: such as Armenian Christians' Defence Committee (under the chairmanship of Albert Spicer, M.P., Treasurer: R.C. Morgan; Hon. Soc.: Rev. W. Evans Darby and Rev. Henry J.B. Heath), the Armenian Relief Fund (President: The Duke of Argyll, K.G.K.T., Vice-President, The Lord Archbishop of York), Scottish Armenian Association (President: The Duke of Argyll); etc.
- <sup>9</sup> The Anglo-Armenian Gazette, No. 1, Vol. 1, October 1893.
- <sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>11</sup> L.P. Benson official letters, Vol. 124, ff. 1-55, Foreign 1893 (Letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> November 1883).
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, (letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> December 1893).
- <sup>13</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 21<sup>st</sup> October 1890).  
Zeitun had been the centre of the Armenian revolutionary movement since 1862.
- Zeitun was the focal point of the disturbances following 1862, but of the history prior to that date, a number of imprisoned clergymen had sent an account to Lord Roseberry. Corruption and oppression were widespread. In 1862, the Porte despatched 44,000 troops against the mountaineers of Zeitun, who destroyed 7,000 of them in self-defence. The Porte had repeatedly violated the independence of these mountain people, who had been forced to revolt.
- Zeitun in 1890, the residence of a Kaimakhan under the Muttesarif of Marash, consisted of about 1,270 Christians and 30 Moslem houses, surrounded by 7 Christian and 22 Moslem villages.
- <sup>14</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated October 1892).
- <sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>16</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 18/30<sup>th</sup> November 1891).
- <sup>17</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 24<sup>th</sup> February 1892).
- <sup>18</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> April 1892).
- <sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* (This figure does not agree with that quoted in previous letters of Minas Cheras, where instead of 554 children he had stated 400).
- <sup>20</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 22<sup>nd</sup> April 1892).
- <sup>21</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 24<sup>th</sup> May 1892).
- <sup>22</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 5/17 August 1892). The letter, originally written in French, has been translated into English.
- <sup>23</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 16<sup>th</sup> May 1894).
- <sup>24</sup> F.O. 78/4334 (Extract from the Saadet of 7<sup>th</sup> October 1890).
- <sup>25</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 31<sup>st</sup> July 1894).
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>27</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 30<sup>th</sup> April 1894).
- <sup>28</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> January 1894).
- <sup>29</sup> L.P. Benson Papers, A4, Foreign 1895. Additional Incidents of the Massacres in Turkey (n.d.).
- <sup>30</sup> L. Nalbandian, Armenian Revolutionary Movement, pp. 69-71 and Kenneth Bourne, The Foreign Policy of Victorian England, 1830-1902, pp. 155-160 and 422-446.
- <sup>31</sup> A document in the Public Records Office under the reference F.O. 78/4683 signed by K. Behesnilian, on the 19<sup>th</sup> December 1895, stated as follows: "Among many others who were forced to accept the religion of Islam, was an Armenian, ordained clergyman of the English Church, who, on his refusal of the offer was killed with torture."
- <sup>32</sup> In this letter, K. Lorian signed himself Zorian, probably to avoid possible repercussions, therefore we will use this name henceforth.

- 
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>36</sup> L.P. Davidson Papers, Z1, Foreign, 1897 (letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> December 1897).
- <sup>37</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>38</sup> Ibid., (letter dated 24<sup>th</sup> December 1897).
- <sup>39</sup> L.P. Benson Papers, Z15, Foreign 1896 (letter dated 1<sup>st</sup> January 1896).
- <sup>40</sup> Appendix 21.
- <sup>41</sup> Appendix 22.
- <sup>42</sup> L.P. Benson Papers, A4, Foreign 1894 (letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> March 1894).
- <sup>44</sup> Appendix 23.
- <sup>45</sup> L.P. Benson Papers, M5, Foreign 1896 (letter dated 3<sup>rd</sup> January 1896).
- <sup>46</sup> Ibid., (letter n.d.)
- <sup>47</sup> Appendix 24.
- <sup>48</sup> Appendix 25.
- <sup>49</sup> Westminster (President), Armenia and the General Election, An Appeal, 8<sup>th</sup> July 1895.
- <sup>50</sup> The Most Incredible Event of the Century, (Information Armenia Bureau), Leaflet No. 2). (From an American resident in Turkey), January 1896.
- <sup>51</sup> Eric Barrington, Armenia! (Information Armenia Bureau), Leaflet No. 1, 7<sup>th</sup> January 1896.
- <sup>52</sup> L.P. Benson official letters. Vol. 141, ff, 116-126. Foreign 1895 (letter dated 23<sup>rd</sup> August 1895).
- <sup>53</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>54</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>55</sup> L.P. Benson official letters, Vol. 133, ff. 63-111. Foreign 1894 (letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> April, 1894).
- <sup>56</sup> F.O. 78/4683 (letter dated 23<sup>rd</sup> November 1895).
- <sup>57</sup> Ibid., (letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> December 1895).
- <sup>58</sup> L.P. Benson Official letters, Vol. 141, ff. 116-126. Foreign 1895. Attacks on Christianity in Turkey (n.d.), see its Appendix Incidents of the Massacres Bearing on this subject (n.d.).
- <sup>59</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>60</sup> Ibid., (letter n.d.).
- <sup>61</sup> Ibid., (letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> December 1895).
- <sup>62</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>63</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>64</sup> Ibid., (letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> December 1895).
- <sup>65</sup> Ibid., (letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> January 1896).
- <sup>66</sup> Ibid., (letter dated 17<sup>th</sup> December 1895).
- <sup>67</sup> According to one of the F.OO. documents, Ref. 78/4794, dated 11<sup>th</sup> November 1896, Mr. J.W. Whittall, President of Armenian Relief Committee of Constantinople, informs Sir P. Currie as follows:  
We have put all our sources of information together and arrive at the conclusion that to relieve Constantinople and the interior in the sense primarily of keeping body and soul together till spring will require at least £95,000 or say £100,000. The detailed figures are as follows: Constantinople £15,000. Bitlis £8,000. Erzeroum £8,000. Sivas £6,000. Hajin £2,000. Mardin Sertr £5,000. Van £10,000. Marash £6,000. Harpoot £15,000. Diarbekir Arabkir £5,000. Grebizonde £2,000. Aintab Aleppo £2,000. Ourfa £5,000. Coesarea, Everek £2,5000. Total £94,000 which with £6,000 for unforeseen calls brings up the total to £100,000.  
This sum will cover bread and food rations chiefly, but also some clothes and covering, some tools, and in the case of manufacturing districts, materials for manufacturing. Primarily the intention is to preserve life during the winter, but undoubtedly the additional result will be that a good many thousands will be so set up as to be enabled to look after themselves next year.  
I trust you will see your way to making an appeal in the above sense and remain . . .
- See also F.O. 198/67, document dated 4<sup>th</sup> July 1897.
- <sup>68</sup> "The Armenian Question", The Cry of Armenia (Third ed.), London, 1895.
- <sup>69</sup> Ibid., p. 13.
- <sup>70</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 38.

---

<sup>72</sup> Gladstone's public speeches on the Armenian Question, 29<sup>th</sup> December 1894; 6<sup>th</sup> August 1895. Mr. Gladstone's 85<sup>th</sup> – an Armenian deputation from “the Armenian national church” presented a chalice to be placed in Hawarden Church (from the London and Paris Armenians). 1895 the Armenians of Tiflis sent Mr. Gladstone a medieval illuminated ms. Of the Gospels (to be seen in St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden). 1895, August, Mr. Gladstone made a great speech at Chestor, pleading for the persecuted Armenians. 1896, September, last speech, again to rally help for the Armenian Christians. At Liverpool.

In Hawarden Church there is a stained glass window showing St. Bartholomew and St. Gregory the Illuminator. Above the two saints, there is an inscription:

“The Noble Company of Martyrs praise Thee”

and underneath

AZ

1890

To the Glory of God and in memory of the Armenians in Turkey who have suffered for the Faith and in undying gratitude for the inspiring example of William Ewart Gladstone this window is dedicated by Arakel Zadouroff of Baku, Russia.

Mr. Gladstone died on May 19<sup>th</sup>, 1898. “Before the coffin was sealed, a jeweled Armenian gold cross was placed beside it – the gift of the Church of that persecuted and afflicted nation.” (Magnus). The body was brought to London to lie in state in Westminster Hall. Describing the scene, The Times of May 25<sup>th</sup> writes:

Over the feet was a crimson embroidered cloth, the gift of an Armenian deputation which visited Hawarden not long ago and presented a painted window to St. Deiniol's Church.

In this issue of May 27<sup>th</sup>, The Times continues:

At the foot of the bier hung a white silk pall, with subdued gold and blue embroideries, displaying to the people . . . the words Requiescat in Pace. This pall was a present from the Armenians to Mr. Gladstone.

<sup>73</sup> Appendix 26.

<sup>74</sup> F.O.P. 93 (xviii), p. 8.

<sup>75</sup> E.A.B. Hodgetts, Round About Armenia, Preface, p. IX.

<sup>76</sup> K.G.K.T. Argyll, Our responsibilities for Turkey, facts and memories of forty years, London 1896, Preface (F.O. 8 vo. 7638).